



SAU Taskforce Updates

Match Violations

SAU Task Force Proposed Solutions to Match Violations Summary of Findings:

Background: The primary aim of this task force work was to thoroughly examine the prevalence and type of urology match violations, adequately define match violations, assess the existing NRMP policies and procedures on Match Violations and investigations, propose and recommend guidelines for the AUA/SAU Match regarding Match Violations including consequences for the same and as such, affect change at the level of the AUA and SAU that more effectively mitigates future violations, intentional or not.

Analysis & Recommendations:

I. Define AUA/SAU Match Violations based on the NRMP Guidelines

See “Proposed Revised Match Guidelines” (also listed as Appendix 5)

II. Conduct a survey to assess depth of Match violations and determine solutions

See Draft Applicant Exit Survey to be performed Jan 2019 and intended as ongoing Exit survey of applicants each cycle

See in progress independent work to survey Program Directors on Match Violations

Task Force to draft educational PowerPoint on Best Practices based on Proposed Revised Match Guidelines if approved

Have applicants and Programs sign electronic attestation to abide by the Match Guidelines when they sign up for Match.

III. Provide Guidelines to Prevent Match Violations/ Process for Investigation

See “Proposed Anonymous AUA/ SAU Reporting Form” (also listed as Appendix 6)

See “Task Force Proposed Process for Investigations”

References:

Task Force Members:

Appendices:

_SAU Task Force Proposed Solutions to Match Violations Report of Findings:

Background:

During the Annual Meeting of the Society of Academic Urology (SAU) on February 10th, 2018, Program Directors Discussion Groups were held on the topic of “How to Improve Upon the Current Match?” where all attendees participated in rotating focus groups to discuss optimization of the Urology Match Process as facilitated by Drs Michael Coburn (Baylor College of Medicine, Blake Hamilton (Utah School of Medicine) and Simone Thavaseelan (Brown University). The issue of Match Violations was discussed in this context and a SAU task force was convened to thoroughly consider the nature and scope of the issue.

Ethical violations and discriminatory behavior in the residency match process may not only violate employment law, but ultimately fails to serve the medical community well. Per the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP), the NRMP “...assumes responsibility for instituting measures to protect the integrity of the matching process by requiring all Match participants to behave ethically and responsibly...” As an independent matching institution, the American Urological Association (AUA) conducts the urology match; yet, the AUA guidelines regarding match violations have not been adequately defined, as violations continue to occur in the match process¹⁻⁵. NRMP guidelines can serve to construct AUA/SAU match-related violation rules (Match Guidelines) that ultimately mitigate future violations.

While initial studies have examined Urology residency match violations^{4,5}, a comprehensive ongoing assessment match violations has not been performed and detailed proposals specifically aimed at decreasing the frequency of violations have not been put forth through AUA or SAU guidelines. The primary aim of this task force work was to thoroughly examine the prevalence and type of urology match violations, adequately define match violations, assess the existing NRMP policies and procedures on Match Violations and investigations, propose and recommend guidelines for the AUA/SAU Match regarding Match Violations including consequences for the same and as such, affect change at the level of the AUA and SAU that more effectively mitigates future violations, intentional or not.

The specific charge was as follows:

- 1) Define SAU/AUA Match violations, based on the NRMP guidelines*
- 2) Conduct a survey to a) determine the depth of Match violations, b) market that the SAU is interested in preventing Match violations and c) determine solutions to mitigate Match violations*
- 3) Render recommendations to the SAU board of directors regarding your analysis of the survey*
- 4) Recommend guidelines for programs and medical students participating in the SAU/AUA Match to prevent Match violations.*
- 5) Make recommendations regarding consequences for first time violators and programs that demonstrate a pattern of Match violations.*
- 6) Investigate anti-trust concerns should the SAU prevent a program from participating in the SAU/AUA Match.*

Analysis & Recommendations:

The work of the task force was divided into the following action items and included review of the hyperlinked documents below in the discussions.

	Action Item
I. Define	Define AUA/(SAU) Match Violations based on the NRMP Guidelines http://www.nrmp.org/communication-code-of-conduct/ http://www.auanet.org/education/auauniversity/residents/residency/urology-and-specialty-matches http://www.nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/MPA-2018-MRM-Applicants_Programs.pdf
II. Conduct	Conduct a survey to assess a) depth of match violations (http://www.jurology.com/article/S0022-5347(18)39443-6/fulltext); http://www.urologypracticejournal.com/article/S2352-0779(18)30034-7/pdf) b) market SAU is interested in preventing violations c) Determine solutions to mitigate Match violations
III. Provide	a) Analysis of survey b) Write guidelines for programs and students to prevent Match violations Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Should the Task Force provide a brief toolkit/ power point to for PDs to share with Faculty, residents, coordinators on the best practices?- Should SAU set up anonymous ways for students to report Match Violations?- Should students be required to sign the Code of Conduct electronically?- Should we have program directors sign a match Participation Agreement attesting that s/he and their program will not be involved in Match violations?- Should we agree, as a Society, that second looks are forbidden?- Should the program director and chair sign the Match attestation or sign the Code of Conduct electronically?- Should this be considered an RRC violation of professionalism?- Recommend consequences for 1st time and repeat program violators- Escalating consequences for programs (e.g publish the program on the SAU and AUA websites, report to RRC/ACGME, remove program from the Match for 1 yr) http://www.nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Violations-Policy.pdf http://nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Case-Summaries-Violations.pdf c) Investigate anti-trust concerns should the SAU prevent a program from participating in the SAU/AUA Match thru communication with Diane Berry, JD of the AUA)

I. Define AUA/SAU Match Violations based on the NRMP Guidelines

The Task Force reviewed the following resources (which are included as appendices 1-4 for reference):

- 1) AUA website “Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs” (<http://www.auanet.org/education/auauniversity/residents/residency/urology-and-specialty-matches>);
- 2) AUA website “Interview Process” (<http://www.auanet.org/education/auauniversity/residents/residency/urology-and-specialty-matches>);
- 3) “NRMP Code of Conduct” (<http://www.nrmp.org/communication-code-of-conduct/>)
- 4) “NRMP Match Participation Agreement” (http://www.nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/MPA-2018-MRM-Applicants_Programs.pdf)

Each item was discussed and compared the AUA Website Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs to the NRMP Code of Conduct. The following table summarizes the comparison analysis and blue font denotes where there are discrepancies.

Match Violations		AUA	NRMP
Offers or commitments of ranking to applicants before match		unacceptable	unacceptable
Offers outside the match before match		unacceptable	unacceptable
Decline to honor the binding match commitment		unacceptable	unacceptable
Post interview Communication			
	Telephone	initiated by program - unacceptable	discouraged, not specifically mentioned
		initiated by applicant - acceptable	discouraged, not specifically mentioned
	email	acceptable	discouraged, not specifically mentioned
	letter	acceptable	discouraged, not specifically mentioned
Reveal/disclose applicant's rank intentions, programs or locations applied to		not specifically mentioned	unacceptable

Ask illegal questions during interview	not specifically mentioned	unacceptable (illegal questions well defined based on age, gender, religion, sexual orientation, family status)
Require second visits or visiting rotations	not specifically mentioned	Program shall not require them or imply they are used in determining applicant placement on rank list

The Task Force went on to discuss the pros and cons of each rule, as well as potential unintended consequences for the applicant and program alike and achieved consensus on the discrepancies. The following 4 domains were analyzed:

1. *Post interview communication*: The Task Force felt that the more detailed stipulations that specified modes of contact (telephone vs email vs letter) by the AUA were useful and should remain in place.
2. *Revealing/ disclosing applicant's list of programs applied to or rank intentions*: The Task force felt that there were a number of reasons that limiting communication about the names, geographic location or other information about programs to which the applicant has or might apply to would be burdensome. Reasons to support programs being able to ask where candidates are applying include 1) being able to ascertain and assess interest in their own program and 2) to serve as a mentor or sponsor to students who express interest in programs that faculty might assist them in connecting with. Consensus on this position was challenging and limited.
3. *Refrain from asking illegal or coercive questions*: The Task Force felt this must be added to the current Urology Match Guidelines but also felt that a simplified education/ faculty development process would be beneficial. As such the Task Force would plan to draft a short slide deck that would be used by Program Directors to share the Match Guidelines Best Practices to faculty around the time of interview season.
4. *Second Visits/ Visiting Rotations*: The language in the NRMP code of conduct is “that the program shall not require them”. The Task Force considered the position of forbidding second visits and visiting rotations altogether (as noted in the Plastic Surgery Guidelines) but felt this was not appropriate for a specialty with a competitive supply-demand ratio such as urology. Second visits have a benefit to applicants to see programs in their “day-to-day” context outside the prepared interview experience that might be helpful to applicants. The cost associated with these visits was felt to be proportionally small in the context of total interview expenses and prohibiting them would limit applicants right to obtain more information of “fit’ with a program. The benefit of visiting rotations for both applicants and programs that fall slightly below the highest tier of competitiveness was felt to be immense (although it may or may not be beneficial to the applicant based on their performance) to allow applicants and programs an opportunity to work together and determine fitness.

Recommendations:

Based on the above analysis, the Task Force recommends maintaining the AUA website Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs as currently published but would propose the following revisions (noted in blue font). AUA/SAU acceptance of this proposed revised Match Guidelines would be the basis of any further documents that the Task Force would draft including further referenced faculty development Guidelines and or applicant or program electronic attestations on the Match Guidelines.

Proposed Revised Match Guidelines based on Task Force Review:

(~~Deletions~~; *Additions*)

Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs

- All vacancies in each program will be offered as part of the match.
- No offers or commitments to "rank an applicant first on my list" will be made to applicants before the match.
- ~~No verbal contact with applicants will be made by anyone from a program after the interviews. Contact by letter is permissible.~~ (this is moved to the Post interview Guidelines)
- No offers will be made to an applicant outside the match until after the match is completed.
- Programs agree to accept any applicant submitted on their ranking list.
- Programs agree that after the match no commitments will be made with an applicant matched with a different program unless there is mutual agreement between all three parties including both program directors and the applicant.

Program Applications/Interviews

- It is the applicant's responsibility to contact each of the programs in which he/she is interested and to follow their application and interview procedures. You should be certain you are aware of each program's requirements, including application deadline, policies regarding pre-urology training and participation in the NRMP match.
- Participation in Electronic Residency Application Service (ERAS®) is on an individual program basis. Check the [ERAS® website](#) for information and a list of programs participating.
- Applicants should know they are under no obligation to reveal their program preferences to any program director and that no participating program director can make a binding offer other than through the match program. Both parties are free to change their intentions without prejudice up to the time that final rank-ordered lists are submitted.
- No changes can be made after a preference list is submitted.
- *Programs will refrain from asking illegal or coercive questions about age, gender, religion, sexual orientation and family status*

Post-Interview Contact

- No verbal contact with applicants will be made by anyone from a program after the interviews. Contact *by email* or letter is permissible.
- Contact by letter or email is always permissible.
- Telephone contact initiated by a program director or department personnel at any level is considered undue pressure and should not take place.

- Telephone calls *and emails* from applicants are acceptable.
- *Programs shall not require second visits or visiting rotations or imply that second visits are used in determining applicant placement on a rank list.*

II. Conduct a survey to assess

The Task force reviewed the available literature on the topic of Match Violations within medicine in general and specific to urology and identified 2 primary publications that were field specific. Publishing authors were on the task force.

In *The National Resident Matching Program Code of Conduct: What is the Degree of Compliance during the Urology Match Process?* ([http://www.jurology.com/article/S0022-5347\(18\)39443-6/fulltext](http://www.jurology.com/article/S0022-5347(18)39443-6/fulltext)), Elsamra et al surveyed all applicants to a single New Jersey urology residency program in the 2017 Match and obtained a response rate of 34%. They found 60% of respondents reported post interview communication and 26% were asked to reveal where they would rank a program and 19% reported post interview communication caused them to rank a program higher than initially planned.

In *Gender-based differences in discriminatory questions asked of urology applicants during residency interviews* ([http://www.urologypracticejournal.com/article/S2352-0779\(18\)30034-7/pdf](http://www.urologypracticejournal.com/article/S2352-0779(18)30034-7/pdf)), Kielb et al assessed rates of interview questions regarding marital status, child bearing, ethnicity and religion. They surveyed 340 urology applicants who applied to a Midwest residency program in the 2016 match and obtained a 50% response rate, 76% of respondents were male, 23% were female. Overall 35% reported that they were asked a personal question that they believed was inappropriate. 54.5% of respondents reported being asked at least one unprompted illegal question on a restricted topic. Women were statistically more likely to be asked about age, parental status and intent for future children. Men were more likely to be asked their opinions and rankings of other residency programs.

The task force felt these were significant contributions to the literature that identify a true signal that match violations in urology are in fact occurring. However, to accurately assess national prevalence, the task force recommended that the AUA/SAU **perform a national survey of applicants following submission of rank lists as part of the participation process to determine the true incidence on an ongoing and yearly basis.** The task force believes that the **timing** of this survey is best to be completed not now or under the current arbitrary timeline but rather after applicants have submitted their rank list to decrease any perceived fear of disclosures on the part of the applicants. Furthermore, the task force had concerns about proposing national policy, particularly where potential punitive decisions might affect both applicants and programs, in the absence of nationally collected data. The task force believes that in order for there to be national buy-in, the AUA/ SAU would need to have demonstrated accumulation of national data so as not to have the unintended consequence of creating incentives for certain programs to recruit outside the match.

The Task force drafted a survey to assess Program Directors attitudes about Match Violations and determine the overall culture and perceptions regarding violations but also policing practices, investigational processes and potential consequences. Since the task force met however, a task force member working on this topic independently prior to the task force convening has released a similar survey and the same intent. The task force believes that therefore this analysis should be completed and reported to the task force rather than repeated by the SAU.

Recommendations:

1. That the AUA survey all applicants who submit a rank list AFTER their rank list has been submitted in order to obtain data. The task force reviewed the literature and discussed individual items that would be relevant for analysis and provided the AUA/SAU a proposed survey:

<Include Draft>

2. Dr Elsamra to report and or publish Program Directors Survey on Match Violations.

III. Provide Guidelines to Prevent Match Violations/ Process for Investigation

The task force consider all the listed questions in the action items.

With regards to solutions to mitigate match violations, the task force felt that **faculty development and education that is delivered from program directors to faculty and all those involved in the recruitment process** would provide real-time guidance on best practices. As such the task force would develop a short power point to summarize these points pending review and acceptance from the AUA/SAU of the Proposed Revised Match Guidelines.

Other solutions discussed and considered included the recommendation to set up an anonymous method for applicants and programs to report Match Violations. This was felt to be best accomplished by using an **anonymous portal** where a party can, but does not have to, disclose their identity or contact information. As such, the task force would recommend the AUA or SAU create a web based form that would allow optional contact information to report a Match Violation. The task force would recommend that this is located near the current location of the contact email address (resmatch@AUAnet.org) on the AUA Website for match related questions. The task force would provide a draft of this form.

The task force discussed the pros and cons of requiring students and program directors and chairs to attest to compliance with the Match Guidelines (ie “signing a code of conduct” however at this time the only published documents are the AUA Match Guidelines and there is no separate code of conduct as there is for the NRMP). The primary benefit was felt to be requiring all parties to make a conscious effort to be aware of and agree to ethically consistent behavior. The primary disadvantage was the potential unintended effect of making this another rote exercise that might eventually be in service of documentation rather than promotion of ethical standards. Nevertheless **the task force unanimously agreed that having both**

applicants and programs sign an electronic attestation to abide by the Match Guidelines when entering into participation should be enacted.

Extensive discussion was held on the process for investigating Match Violations. The NRMP process was reviewed in detail (<http://www.nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Violations-Policy.pdf>; <http://nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Case-Summaries-Violations.pdf>) and was considered as a potential starting point for development of a AUA/ SAU Policy. IT was reviewed and compared to current AUA/SAU guidelines the latter of which are lacking. This analysis is included below:

Violations Policy	AUA	NRMP
Reporting policies	None	Suspected violations to be reported in written or electronic form Form found online http://www.nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Violations-Report-Form-for-Applicants.pdf
Confidentiality	None	Can be done anonymously, however, this could impede the NRMP's ability to investigate the alleged violation *Can request for identity to remain confidential
Timing	None	NRMP to acknowledge written reports within 7 days of the receipt of the report
Disposition/ Consequence of violations		
	AUA	NRMP
If applicant violation was committed	None	NRMP may withdraw any applicant or program from residency match if the NRMP believes it has credible evidence that the applicant or program has violated the terms of this Agreement.
If program violation was committed	None	*NRMP final report will be delivered to program director, institution, chair of GME, ACGME, specialty program director association, NRMP executive committee, party who originally reported violation

Consequence	None	*May be barred from NRMP match and/or identified as Match Violator for 1-3 years or permanently
Consequence	None	*Identification of applicant/program/institution in R3 system as Match Violator

However the task force felt the **Policy outlined in the NRMP** was burdensome, excessively punitive and over bearing. Specifically there seemed to be a presumption of guilt over innocence and while the Policy might be suitable to protect the NRMP in the event of a contentious decision, **the task force rejected it as a useful or feasible basis for replication for the AUA/ SAU.** The task force instead proposed that reported Match Violations (presumably thru the reference portal above) be investigated on **a case by case basis consisting of Committee of a Program Director from each AUA Section** with a Consensus was not achieved on including a Program Coordinator (PC) based on the high variability of training and performance of PCs. As such a violation would be assessed by a group of peers since the Program Directors take ultimately responsibility for the actions of the entire recruitment team.

The task force discussed and considered the following potential consequences for confirmed violations based on the NRMP process as well as consideration of reasonable and feasible actions:

- 1) Written report from Chair of Investigation committee to PD and Chair
- 2) Written report to Program Director and Chair with request for action plan from program on self-assessment and methods to education and prevent recurrent violations,
- 3) Reporting to RRC
- 4) Reporting violation status on AUA/SAU website
- 5) Barring program from participation in Match for 1 year up to 3 years.

The task force was **not in favor of assigning specific consequences to specific violations** but instead deciding on an individual basis what appropriate consequences would be based on the severity, intent, pervasiveness, and depth of the violation, in addition to previous history of violations. While specified consequences would make decision making uniform and is a reasonable goal in high stakes decisions, the task force felt that initial experience in volume and nature of reported violations would need to be defined prior to concluding what are appropriate consequences. Excessive punitive outcomes might have the unintended consequence of incentivizing recruitment outside the match which the task force feels is a greater destabilizer to the Match process than the benefit of a priori defined consequences.

Of note, there is **uncertainty on the part of the Task Force of the national residency community's understanding/perception of the authority of the AUA vs SAU over the match.** This bears clarification from the AUA and SAU in coordination with each other in all materials presented on the Match and in regards to Match Violations.

Recommendations:

1. Task Force to provide to AUA/SAU a short educational PowerPoint for Program Directors regarding Match Guidelines Best Practices for faculty and recruitment team to be delivered by PDs locally at the time of interview season.

<Include Draft>

2. Have applicants and Programs sign electronic attestation to abide by the Match Guidelines when they sign up for Match.

3. Task Force to provide draft of form for anonymous portal reporting that AUA/ SAU would have to maintain on their websites.

Please see Appendix 5 “Proposed Anonymous AUA/ SAU Reporting Form”.

4. Task Force Proposed Process for Investigations:

Committee of Program Director from each AUA Section with Chair assigned to perform investigative process and then arrange discussion of evidence to determine if violation has occurred as based on Proposed Revised Match Guidelines based on Task Force Review.

Committee to discuss potential consequences based on nature of concluded violation. Written report provided from Committee to PD and Chair and AUA/SAU.

References:

1. Hendrickson KRG, Juang T, Rodrigues A, Burmeister JW: Ethical violations and discriminatory behavior in the MedPhys Match. *Journal of applied clinical medical physics* 2017, 18(5):336-350.
2. Brooks JT, Reidler JS, Jain A, LaPorte DM, Sterling RS: Post-Interview Communication During Application to Orthopaedic Surgery Residency Programs. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2016, 98(19):e84.
3. Jena AB, Arora VM, Hauer KE, Durning S, Borges N, Oriol N, Elnicki DM, Fagan MJ, Harrell HE, Torre D *et al*: The prevalence and nature of postinterview communications between residency programs and applicants during the match. *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges* 2012, 87(10):1434-1442.
4. Farber N, Neylan C, Kaplan A, Radadia K, Singer E, Elsamara S. The Urology Match and Post Interview Communication". Moderated Poster AUA, San Francisco, May 2018. In submission to Urology.
5. Keeter MK, Sinfal A, Shah N, Kielb S: Gender-based differences in discriminatory questions asked of urology applicants during residency interviews. *Urology Practice* (2018), doi: 10/1016/j.urpr.2018.02.002.
6. Farber N, Neylan C, Kaplan A, Radadia K, Singer E, Elsamara S. The National Resident Matching Program Code of Conduct: What is the Perceived Degree of Compliance during the Urology Match Process?" Accepted submission. *Urology* 2018.

Prepared by:

SAU Task Force Proposed Solutions to Match Violations convened April - June 2018

Maude Carmel, MD (UTSW/ TX, South Central Section); Maude.Carmel@utsouthwestern.edu

Kirsten Green, MD (UCSF/ CA, Western Section); Kirsten.Greene@ucsf.edu

Sammy Elsamra, MD (UMDNJ, New York Section); sammy.elsamra@rutgers.edu

Stephanie Kielb, MD (Northwestern/IL, North Central Section); skielb@northwestern.edu

Kathleen Kiernan, MD (UWash/WA, Western Section); Kathleen.Kieran@seattlechildrens.org

Jay Simhas, MD (Einstein Urology/ Temple/ PA, Mid Atlantic Section); jaysimhas@gmail.com

Simone Thavaseelan, MD (Brown/RI; New England Section); simonethavaseelan@lifespan.org

Appendices:

Appendix 1: AUA website “Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs”

Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs

- All vacancies in each program will be offered as part of the match.
- No offers or commitments to "rank an applicant first on my list" will be made to applicants before the match.
- No verbal contact with applicants will be made by anyone from a program after the interviews. Contact by letter is permissible.
- No offers will be made to an applicant outside the match until after the match is completed.
- Programs agree to accept any applicant submitted on their ranking list.
- Programs agree that after the match no commitments will be made with an applicant matched with a different program unless there is mutual agreement between all three parties including both program directors and the applicant.

Appendix 2: AUA website “Interview Process”

Interview Process

Program Applications/Interviews

- It is the applicant's responsibility to contact each of the programs in which he/she is interested and to follow their application and interview procedures. You should be certain you are aware of each program's requirements, including application deadline, policies regarding pre-urology training and participation in the NRMP match.
- Participation in Electronic Residency Application Service (ERAS®) is on an individual program basis. Check the [ERAS® website](#) for information and a list of programs participating.
- Applicants should know they are under no obligation to reveal their program preferences to any program director and that no participating program director can make a binding offer other than through the match program. Both parties are free to change their intentions without prejudice up to the time that final rank-ordered lists are submitted.

- No changes can be made after a preference list is submitted.

Post-Interview Contact

- Contact by letter or email is always permissible.
- Telephone contact initiated by a program director or department personnel at any level is considered undue pressure and should not take place.
- Telephone calls from applicants are acceptable.
- See [Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs](#) for more details.

Appendix 3: “NRMP Code of Conduct” (<http://www.nrmp.org/communication-code-of-conduct/>)

CODE

To promote the highest ethical standards during the interview, ranking, and matching processes, program directors participating in a Match shall commit to:

- **Respecting an applicant’s right to privacy and confidentiality** Program directors and other interviewers may freely express their interest in a candidate, but they shall not ask an applicant to disclose the names, specialties, geographic location, or other identifying information about programs to which the applicant has or may apply.
- **Accepting responsibility for the actions of recruitment team members** Program directors shall instruct all interviewers about compliance with Match policies and the need to ensure that all applicant interviews are conducted in an atmosphere that is safe, respectful, and nonjudgmental. Program directors shall assume responsibility for the actions of the entire interview team.
- **Refraining from asking illegal or coercive questions** Program directors shall recognize the negative consequences that can result from questions about age, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and family status, and shall ensure that communication with applicants remains focused on the applicant’s goodness of fit within their programs.
- **Declining to require second visits or visiting rotations** Program directors shall respect the logistical and financial burden many applicants face in pursuing multiple interactions with programs and shall not require them or imply that second visits are used in determining applicant placement on a rank order list.
- **Discouraging unnecessary post-interview communication** Program directors shall not solicit or require post-interview communication from applicants, nor shall program directors engage in post-interview communication that is disingenuous for the purpose of influencing applicants’ ranking preferences.

Appendix 4: NRMP Match Participation Agreement

(http://www.nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/MPA-2018-MRM-Applicants_Programs.pdf)

6.0 Other Obligations of Match Participants

6.1 Duty to Act in a Professional and Ethical Manner

All participants in the *Main Residency Match* shall conduct their affairs in an ethical and professionally responsible manner. The duty under this Agreement to act in an ethical and professional responsible

manner extends throughout the application, interview, matching processes, and SOAP and until the 45th day following the start date of training or the conclusion of any NRMP-related waiver, investigation, or appeal process, whichever is later.

6.2 Restrictions on Persuasion

One of the purposes of the *Main Residency Match* is to allow both applicants and programs to make selection decisions on a uniform schedule and without coercion or undue or unwarranted pressure. All participants in the Match shall respect the right of applicants to freely investigate program options prior to submission of a final rank order list. Both applicants and programs may express their interest in each other; however, they shall not solicit verbal or written statements implying a commitment. Applicants shall at all times be free to keep confidential the names or identities of programs to which they have or may apply. The NRMP recommends that each program director and applicant read carefully the Match Communication Code of Conduct for information on acceptable methods of interaction during the interview and matching processes.

In addition, during the interview and matching processes, it is a breach of this Agreement for:

- (a) a program to request applicants to reveal the names, specialties, geographic locations, or other identifying information about programs to which they have or may apply; or
- (b) a program to request applicants to reveal ranking preferences; or
- (c) an applicant to suggest or inform a program that placement on a rank order list or acceptance of an offer during *SOAP* is contingent upon submission of a verbal or written statement indicating the program's preference; or
- (d) a program to suggest or inform an applicant that placement on a rank order list or a *SOAP* preference list is contingent upon submission of a verbal or written statement indicating the applicant's preference; or
- (e) a program and an applicant in the *Main Residency Match* to make any verbal or written contract for appointment to a concurrent year residency or fellowship position prior to the release of the List of Unfilled Programs.

Only the final preferences of programs and applicants, as expressed on their final certified rank order lists or by offers extended and accepted through *SOAP*, will determine the offering of positions and the placement of applicants through the *Main Residency Match*.

Appendix 5: Proposed Revised Match Guidelines based on Task Force Review

(Deletions; Additions)

Urology Residency Match Guidelines for Programs

- All vacancies in each program will be offered as part of the match.
- No offers or commitments to "rank an applicant first on my list" will be made to applicants before the match.
- ~~No verbal contact with applicants will be made by anyone from a program after the interviews. Contact by letter is permissible. (this is moved to the Post interview Guidelines)~~
- No offers will be made to an applicant outside the match until after the match is completed.
- Programs agree to accept any applicant submitted on their ranking list.

- Programs agree that after the match no commitments will be made with an applicant matched with a different program unless there is mutual agreement between all three parties including both program directors and the applicant.

Program Applications/Interviews

- It is the applicant's responsibility to contact each of the programs in which he/she is interested and to follow their application and interview procedures. You should be certain you are aware of each program's requirements, including application deadline, policies regarding pre-urology training and participation in the NRMP match.
- Participation in Electronic Residency Application Service (ERAS®) is on an individual program basis. Check the [ERAS® website](#) for information and a list of programs participating.
- Applicants should know they are under no obligation to reveal their program preferences to any program director and that no participating program director can make a binding offer other than through the match program. Both parties are free to change their intentions without prejudice up to the time that final rank-ordered lists are submitted.
- No changes can be made after a preference list is submitted.
- *Programs will refrain from asking illegal or coercive questions about age, gender, religion, sexual orientation and family status*

Post-Interview Contact

- No verbal contact with applicants will be made by anyone from a program after the interviews. Contact *by email* or letter is permissible.
- Contact by letter or email is always permissible.
- Telephone contact initiated by a program director or department personnel at any level is considered undue pressure and should not take place.
- Telephone calls *and emails* from applicants are acceptable.
- *Programs shall not require second visits or visiting rotations or imply that second visits are used in determining applicant placement on a rank list.*

Appendix 6: Proposed Anonymous AUA/ SAU Reporting Form

AUA/ SAU Match Violation Report Form for Applicants

Date Submitted: _____
 Program Name: _____
 Institution name: _____
 Match and Year: _____
 Date of Incident: _____

Please describe the alleged violation in detail and include the name of the person(s) whose actions are in question:

Please explain how you became aware of the alleged violation and describe your relationship with the person(s) whose actions are in question:

The following information is NOT required; however, failure to provide it may impede AUA/ SAU's ability to investigate the alleged violation.

Applicant Last Name: _____

Applicant First Name: _____

AUA ID: _____

Applicant Email: _____

Applicant Telephone: _____

If you provided your name and contact information, is the AUA/ SAU authorized to identify you as the person reporting the alleged violation or do you wish your identity to remain confidential?

_____ Can reveal my identity _____ Want my identity to remain confidential